

## REMARKS

Claims 19, 22 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner objects to the recess extending from the thin-film element part. In response, Applicants amended independent claim 19 to clarify that a first recess extends in the longitudinal direction between the thin-film element part and the distal end of the slider. For this reason, withdrawal of the §112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki (JP 03-132910 hereinafter Matsuzaki ‘910). In response, Applicants amended the claims as discussed above with respect to the §112 rejection, and respectfully traverse.

The Examiner cites Matsuzaki ‘910 as teaching a first recess 13/16 and a second recess 111, 112/121,122. However, each of these recesses is positioned along the direction of air flow along the longitudinal length of the rails 11,12. None of these recesses is located between one of the thin film magnetic head elements 2 and a distal end of the slider 1. Rather, only thin film magnetic head elements 2 are located at the distal end of the slider 1.

In contrast, claim 19 is amended to distinguish over the prior art and calls for a first recess extending in a longitudinal direction defined by the direction of air flow to be between the thin film element part and the distal end of the slider. That is, as shown in FIG. 3A, for example, the magnetic head has a first recess 43a positioned rearward of the rail top surface 33a and located between the thin film element part 35 and distal end of the slider.

Since Matsuzaki ‘910 fails to disclose this feature, withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 19, and its depending claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki (JP 03-132910). Applicants believe that the rejection is based upon U.S. Patent No. 5,200,869 (Matsuzaki ‘869), and will respond accordingly. Applicants traverse the rejection as it applies to amended claim 30 because the cited reference fails to disclose (or suggest), among other things, a magnetic head having a slider with a rail formed on the slider, that includes a recess extending in a longitudinal direction between the thin-film element part and the distal end of the slider.

The Examiner cites FIGs. 2 and 3 of Matsuzaki ‘869 as disclosing a recess which is formed within a protective portion 28 at the intersection of surfaces 101 and an end surface of the protective portion. However, Matsuzaki ‘869 does not disclose a rail formed on the slider 1. Rather, the Examiner considers the slider 1 to be a rail. However, Matsuzaki can not disclose or suggest a slider and rail combination having a recess extending between a thin film element part and a distal end of a slider, when all it discloses is a slider without a separate rail. For this reason, withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

New claims 30-31 are added and define further features of the magnetic head of claim 19. Applicants earnestly solicit allowance of new claims 30-31 for the reasons recited above, and also because of the additional features in these claims.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760

May 6, 2005  
300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Tel.: (312) 360-0080  
Fax: (312) 360-9315  
Customer Number 24978